DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 176 FL 021 865

AUTHOR	Hough, Ruth A.
TITLE	The Gwinnett/GSU Language Leadership Team Project.
INSTITUTION	Georgia State Univ., Atlanta. Center for the Study of Adult Literacy.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 93
NOTE	57p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Language Teachers; *Limited English Speaking; *Literacy Education; Program Descriptions; Teamwork; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	Georgia State University; *Gwinnett County School System GA

ABSTRACT

A collaborative project of the Gwinnett County Schools and Georgia State University, federally funded, was designed as an inservice teacher development program to improve the instructional competence of English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and mainstream teachers working with limited-English-proficient (LEP) students in elementary and secondary schools. The approach used was to provide teams of instructors with strategies for coordinating instruction and sharing expertise with colleagues. Most of the training activities in the 40-50 hour course were multi-level, cooperative, experience-based, authentic, and flexibly organized and integrated language and literacy learning across content areas and sociocultural situations. Most training sessions included instructor input, opportunities for teams to adapt content to their own classroom situations, and time and support for work on team projects. Across the project's 2 years, 84 ESL and mainstream teachers were served. Project results were assessed using surveys, interviews, and results of team projects. Most of the teacher changes found to have occurred during the project involved awareness of the special needs and unique capabilities of LEP students and the need for improved communication among ESL teachers, mainstream teachers, and parents. Increased use of instructional strategies and support of LEP students were also reports. (Contains 10 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 176

The Gwinnett/GSU Language Leadership Team Project

Ruth A. Hough

Center for the Study of Adult Literacy
Georgia State University

August 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joanne B. Nurss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL021865

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education
Office of Bilingual Education & Minority Language Affairs,
Title VII Short-Term Training Grant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Overview of the LLT Project	3
Goals and Objectives	5
Development of Training Design	5
Participants	6
Training Implementation	9
Assessment Instruments	14
Results	15
Discussion	26
Conclusions	29
References	31
Appendices	
Appendix A: Assessment Instruments	33
Appendix B: Team Projects	45
Appendix C: Dissemination Efforts	51

Executive Summary

Short-term training programs seek to increase the language instructional support for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students by enhancing their teachers' abilities to offer language-sensitive instruction. One important and largely unmet need in many systems is to increase the opportunities for coordination and collaboration among the teachers who instruct LEP students.

The Gwinnett/GSU Language Leadership Team (LLT) Project was designed to meet the needs of English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) and regular classroom teachers who serve LEP students from kindergarten through high school. It was a collaborative effort of the Gwinnett County Schools and the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy at Georgia State University, funded by a two-year Short-Term Training grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs, Title VII. The training was designed as a 40-50 hour staff development course, with sessions for school-based teams of ESOL and mainstream classroom teachers scheduled at monthly intervals throughout each of two school years. The overall goal of the project was to improve the instructional competence of both ESOL and mainstream teachers who work with LEP students by providing teams of these instructors with strategies for coordinating instruction and sharing expertise with colleagues.

The training designed for the teams of participants incorporated many of the qualities of instruction recommended as effective for LEP students being taught in heterogenous mainstream classrooms. Thus, most of the training activities were multi-level, cooperative, experience-based, authentic, flexibly organized, and integrated, combining language and literacy learning across a variety of content areas and sociocultural situations. Most training sessions included instructor input, opportunities for teams to adapt the content focus to their classroom situations, and time and support for work on the individually-chosen team projects.

Across the two years of the project 84 different ESOL and mainstream teachers were served. Of those, 50 teachers completed Phase I of the Year One training for 1 SDU credit in

summer 1991, 35 completed Phase II of the Year One training for 4 SDU credits during the 1991-92 school year, and 34 completed the Year Two training for 4 SDU credits during the 1992-93 school year. These teachers were instructing a total of 922 ESOL students while they were in the training program. Teachers from Year One of LLT taught an additional 710 ESOL students the following year increasing the number of ESOL students served to 1,632 total.

Results were assessed using a number of instruments developed or adapted for this project, including the Language Leadership Team Classroom and School Survey, the Gwinnett County ESOL Student Survey, questionnaires and interviews at the end of the project period, and the team projects. Major changes from the beginning to the end of the project appeared to be greater awareness of the needs and unique capabilities of LEP students, and the need for increased communication among ESOL teachers, mainstream teachers, and parents. In addition, participants reported an increase in the use of instructional strategies introduced and demonstrated in the training sessions, including comprehensible input, graphic organizers, collaborative tasks, and language-sensitive content instruction. As a result of their team projects, participants continued to work in a variety of ways to support LEP students: sharing ideas with former team members, mentoring new teachers, making conference presentations, participating in cross-grade teaching, and serving on school committees dealing with cultural diversity.

Strengths of the program included opportunities for collaboration, the year-long commitment made by participants, self-selected projects, and the development of leadership potential. Problems encountered included scheduling and retention, and accommodating the wide range of grade levels taught by participants in the training. It is concluded that integrated staff development for ESOL and mainstream teachers offers effective opportunities to increase and diversify their instructional competence with LEP students.

Introduction

Short-term training programs seek to increase the English language instructional support for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students by enhancing their teachers' abilities to offer language-sensitive instruction. These programs vary in the intensity of the training and the scope of the content offered to participants. Often they are offered as a week of day-long training sessions scheduled either just after or just before the regular school year. However, this type of schedule does not allow teachers time to apply new knowledge or teaching strategies in their classrooms. The scope of the content covered may vary from basic survival language to more advanced cognitive-academic language, depending on the level of English language proficiency of the students in a school system and the amount of experience that teachers within a system have in serving LEP students.

Many schools in metropolitan areas have student populations that are becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse. These systems need to provide broader services to their language minority students than the limited pull-out English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) programs that have traditionally been provided. Since regular classroom teachers provide most of the instruction for these students, effective staff development must include these teachers as well as teachers having ESOL as their primary or sole responsibility. One important and largely unmet need in many systems is to increase the opportunities for coordination and collaboration among the teachers who instruct LEP students. The Language Leadership Team Project (LLT) was developed to meet this need.

Overview of the LLT Project

The Gwinnett/GSU Language Leadership Team Project was a short-term training project, designed to meet the needs of ESOL and regular classroom teachers who serve LEP students in the Gwinnett County (Georgia) Public Schools. The project provided an integrated training

experience for teams of these ESOL and regular classroom teachers across all grade levels. It was a collaborative effort of the Gwinnett County Schools and the Center for the Study of Adult Literacy at Georgia State University, funded by a two-year Short-Term Training grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Title VII.

The Gwinnett Public School System has a rapidly growing LEP population, served only by a limited state-funded ESOL instruction program. Due to the lack of a single language minority group, instruction is in mixed-language ESL classes rather than in bilingual classes. Current services to these students consist of one to two daily 55-minute segments of pull-out ESOL instruction, often provided by itinerant teachers. Thus, most of Gwinnett's LEP students spend the majority of their school day in regular classrooms with teachers who are not trained in bilingual/ESOL methods or multicultural approaches that highlight the importance of sensitivity to linguistic and cultural diversity. One method for significantly increasing the education services for LEP students was through appropriate training for regular classroom teachers to work effectively with LEP students in coordination with ESOL teachers.

The training program was designed as a 40-50 hour staff development course, qualifying the participants for 4-5 staff development units (SDUs) used in Georgia for renewing teaching certificates. Sessions were scheduled at intervals throughout the school year. The training participants were selected in school-based teams consisting of one ESOL teacher and four to five regular classroom teachers who served the same LEP students. Training was delivered by experienced bilingual/ESOL instructors. During the second year, these instructors included teachers from the Year One teams. In this way, the potential of developing leadership as well as instructional expertise was realized during the grant period.

Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the project was to improve the instructional competence of both ESOL and regular classroom teachers who work with LEP students by providing teams of these instructors with strategies for coordinating their instruction and sharing their expertise with colleagues.

Specific project goals were identified as follows.

- For the project staff:

  Objective 1: Prepare the instructional teams (ESOL and regular classroom teachers) to coordinate planning, implementation, and evaluation of instruction for their LEP students.

  Objective 2: Prepare the instructional teams to plan new curricula which integrate mainstream content materials with second language and literacy materials.

  Objective 3: Prepare the instructional teams to become language instructional leaders by enabling them to share their team expertise with other faculty and staff.

- For the ESOL teachers in the teams:

  Objective 4: Provide ESOL teachers with specialized knowledge and classroom applications related to second language and literacy development.

- For the regular classroom teachers in the teams:

  Objective 5: Prepare regular classroom teachers to identify linguistic and cultural characteristics of LEP students that may impact on instructional decisions.

Development of Training Design

The initial planning for the staff development course took place during the first eight weeks of the project, from June through August, 1991. During this period the project curriculum personnel (Director, Consultant, GRA, and Instructors) collaborated with the Gwinnett ESOL Coordinator to prepare the overall design and specific activities for the training. A key element of the project design was the opportunity for ESOL and regular classroom teachers to receive

training in two distinct ways: primarily in collaborative groups working on issues of mutual concern, but also in separate sessions addressing appropriate basic or advanced topics. Training activities were designed to take advantage of the participants' diversity in school and grade level, amount of experience with LEP students, and personal teaching style.

The Project Director and Gwinnett ESOL Coordinator met with several first year project participants in June 1992 to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the project, as well as recommendations for future project activities. This feedback was considered in the planning for the design of the second year's training. During June through August 1992 the project curriculum personnel collaborated to plan the schedule and activities for the 1992-93 sessions.

As the training progressed during each project year, modifications were made by the project staff to meet the evolving needs of the project participants. Participants gave evaluative feedback at the end of each training session, and completed a form identifying topic preferences in January of each project year. Instructors used these data to plan training activities that would effectively meet individual participant needs.

During the summer planning periods of each project year (June-August, 1991; June-August, 1992), the Project Director and the Gwinnett ESOL Coordinator also worked together to secure the final sites, dates, and times for the course sessions. All sessions were held in Gwinnett County schools, some in the schools of instructional teams participating in the training.

Instruments and procedures to evaluate the training were selected and developed during July and August, 1991 by the Project Coordinator with the assistance of other project staff directly involved in the instructional planning.

Participants

Participants in the short-term training provided by the LLT Project were ESOL and regular classroom teachers at the elementary, middle, and high school levels in the Gwinnett

County School system. This mix of teachers was chosen to address the instructional needs of LEP students at all grade levels within the school system.

Recruitment. Participants were recruited in May 1991 and spring 1992 through the Gwinnett County staff development course registration procedures. Recruiting efforts were targeted on teachers from settings which most needed and could benefit from strategies to coordinate and integrate instructional programs for LEP students: schools with a pattern of increasing numbers and diversity of LEP students entering during the school year; schools with pull-out ESOL programs in which LEP students receive most of their instruction in regular classroom settings; and schools providing ESOL services with itinerant teachers, making systematic coordination with regular classroom teachers most difficult.

From each year's list of volunteers seeking to participate in the training, the Project Director and Gwinnett ESOL Coordinator selected members of teams that ideally included one ESOL teacher and four to five classroom teachers that served the same LEP students. The teams that were actually formed each year ranged in size from two to six. Each team had at least one ESOL teacher; the classroom teachers in a team sometimes represented several schools rather than one. All team members served LEP students, although the number of students per teacher varied across the school year as school populations shifted.

These recruitment efforts resulted in the initial formation of 13 teams for Year One, four at the high school level, three at the middle school level, and six at the elementary school level. Participants in these Year One teams represented 26 different schools, five high schools, ten middle schools, and eleven elementary schools.

The Year Two training began with seven teams of participants, one at the high school level, two at the middle school level, and four at the elementary school level. Participants in

these Year Two teams represented nine different schools, one high school, three middle schools, and five elementary schools.

Retention. During the first project year, participants were eligible for two phases of training for staff development credit (10 hours of training in Phase I during August for 1 SDU and 40 hours of training in Phase II during the school year for 4 SDU's). During the second project year, the Gwinnett County school system had shifted to a site-based management plan, eliminating the system-wide time slots during the August preplanning period. In addition, the system offered a cultural diversity training course that many of the second year participants were taking as a complement to the LLT Project. Therefore, the second year training was designed with just the 40 hours of training during the school year for 4 SDU credits. To be eligible to receive SDU's, participants could miss no more than one session, and had to successfully complete the assigned team project.

Across the two years of the project 84 different ESOL and classroom teachers were served. Of those, 50 teachers completed Phase I of the Year One training for 1 SDU credit in summer 1991, 35 completed Phase II of the Year One training for 4 SDU credits during the 1991-92 school year, and 34 completed the Year Two training for 4 SDU credits during the 1992-93 school year.

These teachers were instructing a total of 922 ESOL students while they were in the training program. Teachers from Year One taught an additional 710 ESOL students the following year increasing the number of ESOL students served by the LLT program to 1,632 total. Further, these students represented 56 different language/ethnic groups including Spanish, Chinese, Indian, Japanese, Cambodian, Korean, Laotian and Vietnamese. The number of ESOL students to be positively affected by this project will continue to increase each academic year.

Training Implementation

The LLT project was a short-term training program designed to emphasize two-way understanding and communication between the training participants. There was the widespread feeling that ESOL and regular classroom teachers had many valuable insights to share with each other that would improve the quality of education for LEP students, but little time and few vehicles legitimized by the schools through which to accomplish this. By offering training to teams of teachers, some of whom worked in the same schools, the project also intended to develop leadership potential in participants that would extend the impact of the training beyond the project period. Long-term effects were anticipated through further implementation of the projects developed by the teams, as well as continuing collegial relationships of the team members.

Training sessions were scheduled to combine the benefits of information and planning sessions before the school year started with the continuity of sessions throughout the school year. All sessions of the training were heterogeneous in that they included both ESOL and regular classroom teachers from many schools and grade levels. Participants representing a variety of background experiences, teaching styles, and LEP student populations served were encouraged to share and learn from this diversity as well as from the varied perspectives of the project staff.

Training activities implemented with the participant teams incorporated many of the qualities of instruction recommended as effective for LEP students being taught in heterogeneous mainstream classrooms. Thus, most of the training activities were multi-level, using components that required different levels of expertise for the task's completion; cooperative, requiring groups of participants to work together for the task's completion; experience-based, requiring participants to draw on their own experiences for the task's completion; authentic, requiring participants to engage in real-life rather than practice experiences; flexibly organized, allowing

modifications to fit the needs of particular participants; and integrated, combining language and literacy learning across a variety of content areas and sociocultural situations. Planning for these sessions required that the instructors be very flexible and that they plan and teach cooperatively. A combination of instructors with classroom and university/curriculum/research expertise was most effective in meeting the diverse needs of this teacher population.

The instructor positions in the LLT project were filled in Year One by Dr. Barbara Gomez of Berry College and Dr. Mary Jane Nations of Kennesaw State College. These instructors, experienced in second language acquisition and instructional methods, shared responsibility with the Project Director for planning and implementation of the training sessions. As planned in the project proposal, the instructor positions for Year Two were filled by two Gwinnett County ESOL teachers who were successful participants from the Year One training, Ms. Donna Robertson and Ms. Marge Boyle. Dr. Elizabeth Rieken, the Gwinnett County ESOL Coordinator, coordinated arrangements for materials and equipment at the training sites during both project years.

Table 1 presents the schedule of sessions, sites, instructors, and topics for the Year One training course. Table 2 presents the same information for the Year Two training course.

Most training sessions included some type of instructor input, opportunities for teams to process the content focus and apply it to their particular teaching situation, and time for work on the individually-chosen team project with instructor support available. Since many team members were not acquainted with one another at the beginning of the project, instruction in the first sessions included introductory group-building activities that could also be used with LEP students. Training sessions included input in the form of lectures, demonstrations, simulations, guided discussions, and cooperative group work on language and literacy strategies

Table 1

Gwinnett\Georgia State University Language Leadership Team
Training Sessions Schedule 1991 — 1992

DATE	TIME	PLACE	STAFF	TOPICS
Mon Aug 12	8:00 am-2:00 pm	Shiloh HS Media Center	Hough Nations Gomez	Creating a communication & support network for ESOL & regular classroom teachers; sharing information about LEP student characteristics, abilities & behaviors across school settings
Tue Aug 13	8:00 am-2:00 pm	Shiloh HS Media Center	Hough Nations Gomez	Cultural & linguistic characteristics of LEP students; content-based instruction; writing process; forming collaborative work teams; planning thematic, integrated (language & content) curriculum units & activities for ESOL & regular classroom settings
Sat Sep 28	8:30 am-2:30 pm	Gwinnett Tech Lecture Hall	Gomez Nations	Collaborative planning & support; classroom environment, materials & interactions as comprehensible input
Wed Oct 23	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett - Media Center	Gomez Nations	Collaborative planning & support for planning oral language development; thematic, integrated units
Tue Nov 19	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Gwinnett Tech Lecture Hall	Hough Nations	Collaborative planning & support for using comprehension strategies in content areas; planning thematic, integrated units
Tue Jan 21	8:00 am-12:00 pm (K-8)	Gwinnett Tech F1.5	Gomez Hough	Planning for collaborative grouping; uses of environmental & functional print within thematic, integrated units
	12:00 pm-4:00 pm (9-12)	Gwinnett Tech F1.5	Nations	
Tue Feb 4	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett - Media Center	Gomez Nations	Collaborative planning for evaluation and reporting; multi-sensory materials & techniques within thematic, integrated units
Sat Feb 22	8:30 am-1:30 pm	Team Project Development	On-call	Collaborative planning for literacy instruction, materials & evaluation techniques; planning thematic, integrated units
Tue Mar 31	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett - Media Center	Gomez Nations	Collaborative planning for using multi-cultural books; thematic, integrated units
Tue Apr 14	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett - Media Center	Gomez Hough	Collaborative planning for oral & visual scaffolding; strategies for sharing language & literacy expertise
Sat Apr 25	8:30 am-1:30 pm	Gwinnett Tech Lecture Hall	Gomez Hough Nations	Sharing of teams' thematic units & planning strategies; strategies for sharing language & literacy expertise

Table 2

Gwinnett\Georgia State University Language Leadership Team
Training Sessions Schedule 1992 — 1993

DATE	TIME	PLACE	STAFF	TOPICS
Tue Sep 22	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Creating a communication & support network for ESOL & regular classroom teachers; cultural & linguistic characteristics of LEP students; content-based instruction; forming collaborative work teams
Tue Oct 20	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning & support for thematic, integrated (language & content) curriculum units & activities for ESOL & regular classroom settings; classroom environment, materials & interactions as comprehensible input
Tue Nov 17	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning & support for planning oral language development; thematic, integrated units
Tue Dec 8	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning & support for using comprehension strategies in content areas; planning thematic, integrated units
Tue Jan 12	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Planning for collaborative grouping; uses of environmental & functional print within thematic, integrated units
Tue Feb 2	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning for use of multi-sensory materials & techniques within thematic, integrated units
Tue Feb 16	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning for oral & visual scaffolding in literacy instruction; planning thematic, integrated units
Tue Mar 16	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning for using multi-cultural books; thematic, integrated units
Tue Apr 20	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Collaborative planning for evaluation and reporting; strategies for sharing language & literacy expertise
Tue May 4	4:00 pm-8:00 pm	Central Gwinnett HS Media Center	Hough Boyle Robertson	Sharing of teams' thematic units & planning strategies; strategies for sharing language & literacy expertise

in the content areas, comprehensible input, adapted text techniques, comprehension strategies, and informal assessment.

Many sessions were structured with time and instructor support for team processing of the sessions's content focus. This support allowed the personalizing of the general information presented to meet the teacher needs and interests and student abilities represented on each team. Journal writing was introduced as one technique for reporting and sharing information about LEP students in different school settings. A journal sharing time was included at the beginning of each training session as a way to support coordinated planning for LEP students. Team members were encouraged through brainstorming to work out how ideas could be adopted or adapted to their teaching situations and shared with other school staff.

The project instructors also initiated team projects intended to help teachers more successfully initiate and integrate LEP students into the mainstream of school life in the schools of the participants. Originally, each team was to develop a thematic unit integrating content areas for their grade level. However, as the course evolved, it became clear that there was a great range of experience with and acceptance of the thematic unit approach to instruction. For some teams, adding these units to their current curriculum would have enriched the instructional experience for LEP students. Other teams already had extensive experience with building a curriculum around thematic units, or had concerns for their LEP students that could not be effectively addressed with unit teaching. To better meet the diverse needs expressed by these teachers, the team project requirement was adjusted by broadening the criteria for appropriate topics within a general format outline. Training sessions throughout the year included time for the instructors to monitor, provide resources, and support group collaboration on these individually-selected team projects.

Assessment Instruments

The implementation of the LLT Project was evaluated with a number of instruments developed or adapted for this project, as well as through interviews with the participants, and the team projects. Specific instruments included:

Language Leadership Team Classroom and School Survey. This survey assessed the sensitivity of schools and classrooms to cultural diversity. Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which their classroom and their school reflected the characteristics included in each question. The surveys were completed by project participants during the first and last session for each of the project years. In order to gather data from a control group of subjects, project participants were asked to give the survey to a randomly selected colleague who taught the same grade level or subject area at the same school. For ESOL teachers, the survey was given to another ESOL teacher at a geographically close school. The pre- and post-test surveys were mailed by the control group teachers to the ESOL Coordinator. (See Appendix A.)

Gwinnett County ESOL Student Survey. This questionnaire with seven open-ended items was developed to assess project participants' perceptions of the needs and abilities of LEP students, and the instructional activities they considered appropriate for these students. It was completed by project participants during the first and last training sessions of both years. (See Appendix A.)

LLT Project Follow-up Questionnaire - Year One. This questionnaire was developed for the LLT Project to assess some of the long-term effects of the training. Questions focused on uses of the team projects, applications of adapted instructional strategies, and continued contact with team members. It was mailed to Year One participants in spring 1993. (See Appendix A.)

LLT Project Last Session Survey - Year Two. This questionnaire was developed for the LLT Project to assess participants' satisfaction with the training and current application of the

adapted instructional strategies introduced in the training. It was completed by project participants during the last training session. (See Appendix A.)

Interviews. A personal interview was conducted with the Gwinnett County ESOL Coordinator using a structured interview form to assess the overall impact of the LLT Project on the school system. A group interview was recorded for each Year Two project team identifying the processes used to develop the team projects. (See Appendix A.)

Team Projects. Team projects were presented to all participants and invited guests at the last session during each of the project years, and collected in a notebook for distribution to all participants and other interested teachers. Projects were evaluated on appropriateness of approach, clarity and organization of ideas, and usefulness of the recommendations to students, school staff, and parents. Titles and abstracts of the team projects from each year are included in Appendix B. Notebooks (Hough, 1992; Hough, 1993) describing each project were assembled and sent to all project participants in both years.

Results

Classroom and School Survey. Table 3 presents the results of the Language Leadership Team Classroom and School Survey. Teachers rated the aspects of the classroom and school environments indicating the extent to which they felt that these aspects were present. Table 3 shows aspects that were rated as occurring to a great extent during the two years of the project. These results show the impact of system-wide efforts to increase awareness of cultural diversity. Positive effects on teachers' perceptions and behaviors were particularly evident in the higher ratings of all teachers in the second year of the project. Responses of project participants illustrated the trend toward greater communication among ESOL teachers, classroom teachers, and parents.

Table 3

Language Leadership Team Classroom & School Survey: Highly Rated Items

Percentages of responses rated "to a great extent"

	Year 1								Year 2							
	Participant				Control				Participant				Control			
	Pre		Post		Pre		Post		Pre		Post		Pre		Post	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Affirming cultural diversity a top teaching priority	25	71	28	85	17	53	12	50	23	77	28	82	11	48	8	62
6. Long-range curriculum plans promote multi-culturalism	16	44	26	79	31	31	6	25	17	57	20	59	9	39	8	62
8. Use different strategies to teach students with different learning styles & skill levels	28	78	27	82	21	66	10	42	23	77	27	79	16	70	10	77
9. Teaching strategies promote active learning and critical thinking	28	78	30	91	24	75	20	83	23	77	23	68	20	87	9	70
10. High expectation for all students	31	86	29	88	29	91	20	83	28	93	27	79	21	91	12	92
11. Use of non-sexist language	20	56	25	76	23	72	15	63	20	67	23	68	16	70	11	85
12. Use of grading and grouping practices for success of all students	27	75	27	82	23	72	15	63	22	73	23	68	18	83	8	62
14. Special event celebrations reflect diversity	13	36	21	64	14	44	8	33	11	37	19	56	10	43	8	62
15. Active communication with all parents	15	42	15	45	18	56	9	38	7	23	24	71	5	22	8	62
22. Assignment of students to classes to facilitate equal access	9	26	12	36	47	47	11	46	10	33	13	38	15	65	3	23
31. Support for cooperation of ESOL and regular teachers	12	34	17	52	17	53	11	46	7	23	21	62	15	65	6	46

Student Survey. Table 4 presents the results of the Gwinnett County ESOL Student Survey for Years 1 and 2 of the project. There was a general pattern of similarity both in classroom activities and topics that led to high levels of participation and success and that led to low levels of participation and lack of success. Activities with lower language demands and a concrete focus were named most often as successful, and activities with a language focus, especially literacy tasks, were most often named as difficult. This trend did not change over the school year. One noticeable change in this overall pattern was the increase in the difficulty students had with social studies perhaps indicating a greater emphasis on content instruction as the school year progressed. Throughout the participants' responses, the diversity of viewpoints and experiences of teachers from many different schools and grade levels was evident in the large number of different responses given to each of these questions, indicated as "other" in the table. Examples of other responses include drama, cooking, geography, spelling, and problem solving.

While teachers consistently named observation and imitation as major strategies used by ESOL students, work with peer groups and attention to visual cues increased in importance over the school year. Many of the strategies used by teachers to assist ESOL students also remained stable, but there was a shift in emphasis from reliance on general social strategies (non-threatening environment, positive feedback) to the addition of more academically-focused strategies (cooperative groups, use of visuals). Concerns for understanding student needs, accepting cultural diversity, teacher training, and the academic success of ESOL students in mainstream classes were commonly expressed by many participants. The major change from the beginning to the end of the project appeared to be a greater awareness of the need for increased communication among ESOL teachers, classroom teachers, and families of ESOL students. In addition, in the post-survey teachers each year were able to more specifically

Table 4
Gwinnett County ESOL Student Survey

1. What classroom activities or topics do your ESOL students complete most successfully?

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Math	28	55	12	37	9	33	10	32
Art	22	43	10	30	9	33	14	45
Hands-on	19	37	8	24	10	37	10	32
Collaborative groups	15	29	9	27	3	11	20	65
Music	9	18	3	9	6	22	5	16
Language Arts	12	24	4	12	4	15	9	29
Science	10	20	6	18	5	19	8	26
Other Topics/Number of responses for these topics*	16/26	< 20	8/14	< 20	15/27	< 20	12/28	< 20

2. What classroom activities or topics give ESOL students most difficulty?

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reading	34	67	12	36	11	41	8	26
Writing	25	49	6	18	14	52	12	39
Social Studies	9	18	7	21	1	4	8	26
Oral Communication	5	10	5	15	11	41	8	26
Oral Reports	6	12	2	6	5	19	11	35
Other Topics/Number of responses for these topics*	26/56	< 20	15/22	< 20	7/14	< 20	16/28	< 20

* *First number indicates the number of other topics listed. Second number indicates the number of response for these topics. Percentage represents the percent of responses for each of these other topics individually.*

3. What classroom activities or topics lead to high levels of participation for your ESOL students?

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Art	18	35	6	18	8	30	13	42
Hands-on	18	35	9	27	8	30	13	42
Culturally relevant	15	29	11	33	2	7	--	--
Cooperative Groups	12	23	10	30	12	44	13	42
Math	7	14	8	24	3	11	4	13
Music	11	22	5	15	6	22	5	16
Computer	1	2	2	6	2	7	7	23
Other Topics/Number of responses of topics*	23/65	< 20	13/21	< 20	11/19	< 20	12/30	< 20

4. What classroom activities or topics lead to low levels of pariticipation for your ESOL students?

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Oral presentations, large group discussions	15	29	6	18	10	37	9	29
Reading	15	29	9	27	8	30	7	23
Writing	9	18	3	9	10	37	10	32
Oral Communication	11	22	5	15	8	30	8	26
Other Topics/Number of responses of topics*	24/40	< 20	16/28	< 20	5/11	< 20	9/21	< 20

* *First number indicates the number of other topics listed. Second number indicates the number of response of topics. Percentage represents the percent of responses for each of these other topics individually.*

5. What strategies do you think ESOL students use to be successful in your classroom? How well do they work?

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Observation	24	47	10	30	9	33	11	35
Buddy	20	39	--	--	1	4	--	--
Imitation	18	35	11	33	11	41	13	42
Group work	10	20	17	52	8	30	11	35
Listening	4	8	5	10	7	26	7	23
Visual Cues	1	2	5	10	--	--	7	23
Other Topics/Number of responses of topics*	22/40	< 20	9/11	< 20	8/14	< 20	6/22	< 20

6. What strategies do you use to support ESOL students' success and participation in your classroom? How well do they work?

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Non-threatening environment	15	29	--	--	1	4	2	6
Visuals	9	18	12	36	4	15	6	19
Positive feedback	11	22	2	6	15	56	8	26
Peer buddies	20	39	5	15	12	44	15	48
Modified assignments	9	18	5	15	9	33	6	19
Cooperative group work	7	14	14	42	8	30	12	39
Individual help	10	20	4	12	7	26	4	13
Personal interest	4	8	--	--	--	--	10	32
Extra time	3	6	--	--	--	--	7	23
Other Topics/Number of responses of topics*	31/48	< 20	18/29	< 20	9/10	< 20	10/19	< 20

* *First number indicates the number of other topics listed. Second number indicates the number of response of topics. Percentage represents the percent of responses for each of these other topics individually.*

7. List your three main concerns about ESOL students in Gwinnett schools.

	1991-1992				1992-1993			
	Pre (N=51)		Post (N=33)		Pre (N=27)		Post (N=31)	
Activities/Topics	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**	**f**	**%**
Teacher preparation	14	27	10	30	5	19	3	10
Acceptance of cultural diversity	17	33	7	21	7	26	12	39
Academic success in mainstream classes	10	20	8	24	10	37	15	48
Communication with families	11	22	11	33	6	22	10	32
Understanding students' needs	12	24	13	39	3	11	7	23
Communication/support for mainstream teachers	4	8	8	24	4	15	2	6
Maintenance of cultural identity/self-esteem	4	8	2	6	10	37	5	16
Isolation	12	24	2	6	6	22	7	23
Limited resources	10	20	5	15	5	19	8	26
Limited use of ESOL strategies	9	18	10	30	4	15	9	29
Other Topics/Number of responses of topics*	20/51	< 20	7/12	< 20	3/6	< 20	5/12	< 20

* *First number indicates the number of other topics listed. Second number indicates the number of response of topics. Percentage represents the percent of responses for each of these other topics individually.*

identify situations and strategies of concern with LEP students. There was increased use of terms such as comprehensible input, graphic organizers, collaborative tasks, and language-sensitive content instruction that had been introduced in course sessions.

Follow-up Questionnaires: Years One and Two. Effects of the project on the teachers who participated were also measured through responses on questionnaires distributed at the end of the project period. To assess longer-term effects, Year One participants were asked to complete a Follow-up Questionnaire one school year after their participation in the training had ended. Year Two participants were asked to address some of the same questions with a shorter-term frame of reference on the Last Session Survey. Numerical results from these questionnaires are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

As indicated by the large number of ESOL students and the differing language groups, the content and strategies contained in the training had great potential to impact instruction for ESOL students in this school system. The team projects had lasting impact for their developers; most of the first year teams continued to implement their projects after the training ended. There has also been a diffusion effect, with projects of all types being used by other teams in both the first and second year training groups.

Participants reported working in different ways to support LEP students as a result of participating in the LLT project. Most continue to work with their team members, sharing ideas, mentoring new teachers, making conference presentations, participating in cross-grade teaching, and serving on school committees that deal with cultural diversity issues. Participants reported trying out many of the teaching strategies demonstrated in the workshop sessions in their classrooms; graphic organizers, multicultural books, storytelling, collaborative learning strategies, and manipulative materials had been used most broadly.

Table 5

Language Leadership Team Project
Follow-up Questionnaire: Year One

How many ESOL students did you teach in:	Year 1	School year following participation
ESOL Teachers	398	495
Regular Teachers	200	215
TOTAL	598	710

Number of Schools served		13
		YES
1.	Have you used the results of your LLT project this year?	83%
2.	Have you used the results of any project developed by another team?	41%
3.	Have you worked with any of the members of your LLT team this year?	62%
4a.	As a result of your participation in the LLT project, do you notice any differences in *your perceptions of:*	
	a. LEP students	31%
	b. "regular" students	28%
	c. other teachers	34%
	d. parents	21%
	e. administrators	10%
	f. other school staff	17%
4b.	As a result of your participation in the LLT project, do you notice any differences in *your ways of working with the following groups?*	
	a. LEP	59%
	b. "regular" students	55%
	c. other teachers	62%
	d. parents	48%
	e. administrators	34%
	f. other school staff	41%
5.	Are you currently using any of the teaching strategies that were presented or demonstrated in the LLT sessions?	76%
8.	Would you recommend participation in a project similar to the LLT project to a colleague?	93%

Table 6
Language Leadership Team Project
Last Session Survey: Year 2

How many ESOL students did you teach in:	Year 2
ESOL Teachers	195
Regular Teachers	129
TOTAL	324

Number of Schools served	8

	QUESTION	YES
1a.	As a result of your participation in the LLT project, do you notice any differences in *your perceptions of*:	
	a. LEP students	45%
	b. "regular" students	44%
	c. other teachers	28%
	d. parents	28%
	e. administrators	10%
	f. other school staff	17%
1b.	As a result of your participation in the LLT project, do you notice any differences in *your ways of working with the following groups?*	
	a. LEP	52%
	b. "regular" students	48%
	c. other teachers	55%
	d. parents	52%
	e. administrators	31%
	f. other school staff	38%
2.	Are you currently using any of the teaching strategies that were presented or demonstrated in the LLT sessions?	96%
3.	Have you used the results of any project developed by any of last year's teams?	38%
5.	Would you recommend participation in a project similar to the LLT project to a colleague?	85%

Participants reported changing their perceptions, and particularly their behaviors with many groups of people who influence the school success of LEP students. The most common changes in perception included a greater awareness of the cultures and needs of LEP students and their parents. Many participants also noted that they are more cognizant of the needs and capabilities of *all* students. Changes in behavior with students included the use of more variety and creativity in the materials, groupings, and tasks used in instruction. A large number of participants, both regular classroom teachers and ESOL teachers, reported that they were now treated as a valuable resource by other teachers, and many stressed the importance of the team approach among not only teachers, but also administrators and parents, as crucial to the continued school success of LEP students.

Interviews. Interviews at the end of the project with participants and system administrators indicated that the course experience and development of team projects made a lasting impact on participating teachers and indirectly on other staff members in their buildings and on students. Teachers acquired broader knowledge of multicultural content, the family's role in the education of LEP students, and the available materials that support the integrated teaching of language, literacy, and content in such areas as mathematics, science, and social studies. The structured time to communicate and collaborate on mutual goals for the benefit of LEP students was noted as a novel approach to bridge some of the gaps between ESOL and mainstream teachers.

The team projects were presented to all participants and invited guests at the last course session of each year. These projects were developed in a variety of formats, including integrated curriculum units, bibliographies of multicultural support materials to supplement adopted curriculum units, survival kits of manipulative materials for newly-arrived students,

adaptations to make grade-level instructional materials more comprehensible to second language learners, and strategies to involve parents more fully in LEP students' school experiences. Abstracts of each team project are included in Appendix B. Additional information about these projects can be found in TESOL in Action, a publication of Georgia TESOL (Rieken & Hough, 1993).

Discussion

The data provide a positive overall evaluation of the success of the LLT project. Both ESOL and mainstream teachers increased their instructional competence through their exposure to a variety of alternative materials and instructional strategies adapted to meet the special needs of their LEP students. In addition, they benefited from opportunities to share viewpoints and expertise with colleagues coming to the sessions with a wealth of different background experiences relevant to teaching LEP students.

Each of the objectives of the program was fulfilled: instructional teams were provided with materials, demonstrations, time, and support to coordinate the planning, implementation, and evaluation of instruction integrating mainstream content materials with second language and literacy materials (Objectives 1 and 2). Through self-selected team projects that addressed problems identified for specific school settings, team members developed expertise with materials and skills in collaboration, negotiation, and presentation that encouraged them to take leadership roles within their school system to disseminate their ideas (Objective 3). The project staff designed and implemented special sessions on second language acquisition and cultural influences for mainstream teachers, and literacy and comprehension strategies appropriate to LEP students for ESOL teachers. Additional resources were provided and circulated to all participants requesting them. Requests were on such topics as literacy, content-based instruction,

collaborative activities, and other strategies adapted to meet the special needs of LEP students (Objectives 4 and 5).

Strengths of the program. The LLT project had several elements that contributed to its success as a short-term training program. These included:

1) Collaboration — Participants gained support from one another to try novel approaches to instructional challenges in ways that probably would not have been attempted individually. Appreciation for diversity developed as members of teams shared their own unique perspectives and talents in a variety of ways.

2) Year-long commitment — Participants were able to attempt more enduring changes in instructional practices than would usually be stimulated by short-term training. Sessions spread over ten months encouraged participants to try new ideas in their classrooms, with the assurance that they could get continued support and additional ideas from other participants and the project staff if modifications were needed. The longer time period also provided time for team members to build meaningful and lasting relationships, and negotiate longer-term and more innovative projects than otherwise might have been possible.

3) Self-selected team projects — Because the team projects were chosen by teams within a broad framework of improving instruction for LEP students, the final products took many unique forms that reflected the individual strengths and styles of the team members as well as the needs of particular school settings. Team members developed collegial skills while negotiating the selection of a topic all could agree was important and worth the effort of completing it. Team members also increased their awareness of the many networks of contacts and

resources that each of them possessed that could be tapped to the benefit of their students.

4) Development of leadership potential — Especially through development of the projects, participants increased their expertise and visibility as advocates for LEP students in their school communities. Participants increasingly served as informal contacts for teachers new to the system or teachers new to the experience of teaching LEP students. Leadership roles were also assumed in other more formal ways: first-time presentations at professional conferences, initiation and chairing of cultural diversity and international student support committees at the school level, and leadership on local committees at the 27th Annual TESOL Conference in Atlanta in 1993. Finally, two of the first year participants served very successfully as instructors for the second year, adding the credibility of current classroom experience to their presentations.

5) Training model — This short-term project provided an opportunity to develop, implement, and evaluate a training model that is relatively quick, easy, and cost-effective for local school systems to implement. A summary of this model and how it might be implemented is described in a journal article (Hough & Rieken, 1993).

Problems encountered. There were several problems encountered that should be avoided in future short-term training programs, if possible. These included:

1) Scheduling and retention — While the year-long schedule of sessions had many advantages, it did lead to problems of recruiting and retaining the desired number of participants. Attrition was a particular problem in the first year when participants were drawn from 26 different schools at all grade levels. Conflicts

were inevitable with school system and other extracurricular demands on the professional staffs of so many schools at different levels. Some first year participants may not have realized the intensity of the demands of the course since it had not been offered previously. Saturday sessions were uniformly unpopular, and were replaced in the second year with additional weekday evening sessions. By the second year, the expectations of the course were well-known in the system. Perhaps for this reason, a smaller number of participants than planned could be recruited to attend. However, all these Year Two participants completed the entire course.

2) Accommodating wide range of grade levels — Designing sessions to meet the diverse needs of teachers in classrooms from kindergarten through high school was a constant challenge which required great flexibility on the part of the instructors. Many participants were willing and eager to hear the viewpoints of others, and to consider adaptations to fit instructional strategies to their exact classroom situations; however, some were dissatisfied with what they perceived as mismatches to their needs. Some teachers, particularly those at the high school level, had difficulty reconciling an integrated content-language approach to their focus on a particular subject area.

Results of the LLT project have been disseminated through publications and conference presentations. These are listed in Appendix C.

Conclusions

The LLT project offered the participants an opportunity to increase and diversify their instructional competence with LEP students through combinations of mainstream content materials and second language and literacy materials. In addition, it offered a structure for

developing the expertise and collaborative skills necessary to become language instructional leaders in their school system. It helped participants to understand more fully the cultural backgrounds of their students and the possible effects on the language and literacy development so crucial to school success. By training both ESOL and regular classroom teachers as a team, the impact on both ESOL students and other school personnel was greatly increased and will be long-lasting.

References

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Turning on learning. NY: Merrill.

Hough, R. A. (Ed.). (1992). Gwinnett/GSU language leadership team projects, Year One. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University.

Hough, R. A. (Ed.). (1993). Gwinnett/GSU language leadership team projects, Year Two. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University.

Hough, R. A., & Rieken, E. Language leadership teams: Staff development for ESOL and mainstream teachers. Submitted for publication in TESOL Journal (1993).

Rieken, E., & Hough, R. A. The school-based language leadership projects: Support for teachers, students, and families. TESOL in Action, in press (1993).

Appendix A
Assessment Instruments

Language Leadership Team Classroom & School Survey

This instrument can be used for assessing the workplace. Indicate in each blank: 4 - To a great extent, 3 - Somewhat, 2 - Very little, 1 - Not at all.

Classroom Level

____ 1. To what extent do you consider affirming cultural diversity a top priority for your teaching?

____ 2. To what extent do visuals (charts, pictures, etc.) reflect cultural and linguistic diversity?

____ 3. To what extent do your regular instructional materials include people who differ culturally and linguistically?

____ 4. To what extent do supplementary materials do this?

____ 5. To what extent do your daily lessons reflect cultural diversity?

____ 6. To what extent do your long-range curriculum plans promote multiculturalism?

____ 7. To what extent do you use minorities as resource people other than on special occasions?

____ 8. To what extent do you use different strategies to teach students with different learning styles and skill levels?

____ 9. To what extent do your teaching strategies promote active learning and critical thinking?

____ 10. To what extent do you set and maintain high expectations for all your students?

____ 11. To what extent is non-sexist language used?

____ 12. To what extent do grading and grouping practices encourage and reward success for all students equally?

____ 13. To what extent do your tests reflect sensitivity to multicultural education?

____ 14. To what extent do plans for "special event" celebrations reflect diversity based on race, ethnicity, religion or gender?

____ 15. To what extent do you actively try to communicate with parents, especially those of lower-class or minority backgrounds?

____ 16. To what extent are notices sent home in the parents' language?

School Level

____ 1. To what extent does school philosophy explicitly address multicultural education?

____ 2. To what extent do visuals in the school environment reflect multiculturalism in a nonstereotypic manner?

____ 3. To what extent is there a plan to ensure that curriculum and classroom materials school-wide reflect multiculturalism?

____ 4. To what extent do library materials reflect cultural diversity?

____ 5. To what extent are resources, in-service, and planning time made available to help the staff work with multicultural education?

____ 6. To what extent do policies and practices for assigning students to instructional groups and courses facilitate equal opportunity and equal access to a strong education?

____ 7. To what extent does the school support and encourage bilingualism or multilingualism for all students?

____ 8. To what extent does the staffing pattern provide students with diverse role models in nonstereotypic roles?

____ 9. To what extent do special events for the whole school reflect cultural diversity?

____ 10. To what extent are testing procedures nonbiased and used to help teach rather than categorize students?

____ 11. To what extent is there a plan to involve actively all parents, especially lower-class or minority ones?

____ 12. To what extent is instruction available in the language of linguistic or cultural minorities?

____ 13. To what extent do school lunch menus reflect the culturally diverse taste of students?

____ 14. To what extent do extracurricular activities provide for the diverse interests and cultural backgrounds of students?

____ 15. To what extent are cooperative working relationships between ESL education and regular education staff supported and encouraged?

Adapted from: Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Turning on learning. NY: Merrill.

8/91

Gwinnett County ESOL Student Survey

Please respond to each question referring to ESOL students you have taught in the recent past. Thank you for helping us to understand how ESOL students are functioning now in classrooms so that we can continue to plan the best programs to serve them.

1. What classroom activities or topics do your ESOL students complete most successfully?

2. What classroom activities or topics give ESOL students most difficulty?

3. What classroom activities or topics lead to high levels of participation for your ESOL students?

4. What classroom activities or topics lead to low levels of participation for your ESOL students?

5. What strategies do you think ESOL students use to be successful in your classroom? How well do they work?

6. What strategies do you use to support ESOL students' success and participation in your classroom? How well do they work?

7. List your three main concerns about ESOL students in the Gwinnett schools.

Grade Level _____

Subject(s) Taught _____

Language Leadership Team Project: Year One
Follow-up Questionnaire

Name _____

Grade(s) or Subject(s) Taught _____

How many ESOL students did you teach in 1991-92? _____
1992-93? _____

If an ESOL teacher: Full-time _____ Part-time _____
Number of Schools Served _____

1. Have you used the results of your LLT project this year? If so, how?

2. Have you used the results of any project developed by another team? If so, which one(s)? How?

3. Have you worked with any of the members of your LLT team this year? If so, how? Are you working with these colleagues in a different way than you did before the LLT sessions?

FOLLOW-UP - 2

4. As a result of your participation in the LLT project, do you notice any differences in **A)** your perceptions of, or **B)** your ways of working with the following groups?

A	**B**	
____	____	LEP students
____	____	"regular" students
____	____	other teachers
____	____	parents
____	____	administrators
____	____	other school staff

For "YES" responses above, please note briefly the changes.

5. Are you currently using any of the teaching strategies that were presented or demonstrated in the LLT sessions? If so, please describe briefly.

6. What was the most beneficial thing for you about your participation in the LLT project?

FOLLOW-UP-3

7. What was the least beneficial thing for you about your participation in the LLT project?

8. Would you recommend participation in a project similar to the LLT project to a colleague?

_____ Check here if you would like to receive an annotated bibliography of multicultural books developed during the 1992-93 project period.

_____ Check here if you would prefer to respond to these questions or give additional information by phone. Please suggest the best day and time to call.

_____

Thanks for your response, and best wishes for a successful spring.

Language Leadership Team Project: Year Two
Last Session Survey

Name _____

Grade(s) or Subject(s) Taught _____

How many ESOL students did you teach in 1992-93? _____

If an ESOL teacher: Full-time _____ Part-time _____
Number of Schools Served _____

1. As a result of your participation in the LLT project, do you notice any differences in **A)** your perceptions of, or **B)** your ways of working with the following groups?

A	**B**	
_____	_____	LEP students
_____	_____	"regular" students
_____	_____	other teachers
_____	_____	parents
_____	_____	administrators
_____	_____	other school staff

For "YES" responses above, please note briefly the changes.

2. Are you currently using any of the teaching strategies that were presented or demonstrated in the LLT sessions? If so, please describe briefly.

3. Have you used the results of any project developed by any of last year's teams? If so, which one(s)? How?

4. What was the most beneficial thing for you about your participation in the LLT project?

5. Would you recommend participation in a project similar to the LLT project to a colleague? Why or why not?

Thanks for your response, and best wishes for a successful spring.

LEA ESOL Coordinator Interview: Year Two

Language Leadership Team Project Wrap-Up

General

From your perspective in the school system, what have been the effects of the Lanugage Leadership Team project?

Specific

What have been the effects of the Language Leadership Team project on:

-- ESOL teachers
-- mainstream teachers
-- relationships among mainstream and ESOL teachers
-- instruction of ESOL students
-- concepts of language leadership and a team approach in support of ESOL students
-- other comments

Group Interview Questions for Language Leadership Teams: Year Two
Project Development Processes

Test the tape recorder by giving your team name, the names of your team members, and the schools in which you teach. Rewind to check that the recorder is working and that all members can be heard.

Please guide your discussion with the following questions. Add any relevant comments that go beyond these starting questions.

1. What is the main topic or focus of your project? How did you select it?

   -- What other ideas did you consider?
   -- How did you eliminate them?
   -- How did you zero in on your final topic/focus?
   -- Did student needs, team member interests, some other factor(s) predominate in your decision-making?

2. How did your team members work together on the project?

   -- How did individual members contribute their unique talents/information, etc.?
   -- How did you negotiate/mediate the contributions of individual members into one cohesive product?

3. What was the best thing about working on this project?

4. What was the most difficult thing about working on this project?

5. How do you think your project will be used by your team or by others?

Appendix B

Team Projects

GWINNETT/GSU LANGUAGE LEADERSHIP TEAM PROJECTS: YEAR ONE

TEACHER SUPPORT

The four projects in this section focus on the kinds of support that can be offered to teachers of LEP students. Many of these strategies can be particularly helpful for classroom teachers with limited previous experience with second language learners.

Teacher Survival Kit (Elementary)
(by Barbara Mason, Marilyn Mock, Deborah Tozzi, Carol Allen, Suthinee Suktrakul)

The Teacher Survival Kit project grew from a need for centrally-located materials that could be used to alleviate the frustration felt by teachers during the first critical days after the entry of a new LEP student. These materials can be used as a short-term bridge to integration into the mainstream classroom environment.

ESOL Support Teams (High School)
(by Ernie Blankenship, Knox Porter, John Waggener, Dianne O'Neal)

A longer term bridging technique is illustrated in the second project, describing a mentoring process for new teachers of sheltered high school courses. Meeting the needs of both teachers and increasing numbers of older LEP students is a hallmark of this approach.

Introduction to Middle School (Middle School)
(by Marge Boyle, Julie Laird, Becky Kennerly, Louise Cole)

One of the most difficult passages for LEP students to negotiate is the entry to a school system which may be very different from their past experiences. Often teachers do not have adequate time or skills in students' native languages to offer as much assistance as they would like. The Introduction to Middle School project takes an innovative approach to this situation by producing a videotape showing scenes that illustrate basic information accompanied by student narration in six native languages represented in this school community.

Model for Staff Development with Follow-up Evaluations (High School)
(by Patsy Thompson, Janice Justice)

The fourth project in this section gives a resoundingly positive answer to the question of whether teachers of older LEP students want and can benefit from staff development focused on second language learning strategies. Benefits of this program include changes in both knowledge and attitude toward the special needs and abilities of LEP students.

THEMATIC UNITS

The two projects in this section focus on classroom approaches to teaching content and language in integrated ways. While these thematic units were developed for students at opposite ends of the public school continuum, they contain concepts of universal appeal and instructional strategies that may be adapted to students at other levels of content knowledge and language ability.

Thematic Unit - Welcome to America (Elementary)
(by Paula Mathis, Pam Parker, Nancy Loftin, Cathy Blanton)

The "Welcome to America" theme is one of high interest and immediacy to second language learners, a critical aspect for motivation, purposeful instruction, and meaningful learning. Especially noteworthy is the variety of ways students at different language levels may become actively involved in these activities.

Thematic Unit - What Will I Be When I Grow Up? (High School)
(by Raul Fernandez, Steven Coleman, Karen Adams)

An introduction to an array of possible job opportunities is another highly pragmatic topic to students at all levels. These authors give special attention to the use of functional print in authentic contexts in activities that may ease the transition of student from the world of school to the world of work.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Ideas for adapting the classroom and school environments to support teaching and learning for second language learners and their families are the focus of the four projects in this section. Throughout these projects runs the theme of the importance of small changes to making LEP students and their families a welcome and productive part of the larger school community.

Survival Kit Involving Students, Teachers, and Families in Beginning Reading (Elementary)
(by Pat Darzi, Suzanne de Bone, Lois Jernigan)

This project outlines a variety of simple teaching materials that can be used both in the classroom and at home to support beginning reading. A central idea is the concept that literacy permeates the experience of participants in this culture, and that cross-cultural activities can be an important aspect of literacy learning.

Protocol for L2 Learners to Approach L2 Text (Middle School)
(by Cheryl Wienges, Linda Koch, Linda Camp, Lynda Ashby)

Middle school students can often be assisted in processing different types of school materials by directing their attention to the organizational features of these texts. Students use a number of graphic organizers not only to comprehend texts in content areas, but also to create written and visual texts of their own.

Multicultural Thematic Support Materials: Enhancing the Curriculum (Elementary)
(by Donna Robertson, Julie Hanjian, Diane Hughes, Rene Humphreys)

Enriching the curriculum at any level using integrated instructional techniques requires the collection of many related curriculum materials. This elementary school team emphasized the organization of multicultural materials that would support second language learners in school-adopted thematic units.

Small World - Adopt-A-Family (Elementary)
(by Laura Tyson, Wanda Martin, Sonia Rojales, Charlotte Hall, Regina Hughes, Cathie Gober)

The primacy of the family to successful school experiences is the focus of the "Small World" project. Strategies are recommended to bridge the isolation felt by many families of LEP students by forming a variety of links to adopting families in the same school.

THE GWINNETT/GSU LANGUAGE LEADERSHIP TEAM PROJECTS: YEAR TWO

WELCOMING ESOL STUDENTS

The five projects in this section focus on the kinds of support that can make ESOL students' early school experiences more successful and less stressful. Many of these ideas can be particularly helpful for schools or teachers with limited previous experience with second language learners. Throughout these projects runs the theme of how important small changes can be to making ESOL students and their families a welcome and productive part of the larger school community.

Welcome ESOL: Registration Made Easy (Middle School)
(by Phyllis Ableman, Lisa Clausen, Susan Fourqurean, Kathy Kelley, Becky Kenerly, Becky Tatum)

One of the most difficult passages for ESOL students and their parents to negotiate is the entry to a school system which may be very different from their past experiences. Often teachers and other school personnel do not have adequate time or skills in students' native languages to offer as much assistance as they would like. The Welcome ESOL project proposes a multifaceted approach to meet this challenge: enlisting a journalism class to produce a videotape introducing the school, seeking translated registration materials, and planning PTA programming targeted to parents of ESOL students.

What in the World do I do with an ESOL Student? (Elementary)
(by Doris Mann, Hilary Nigro, Stephanie Norton, Lisa Pritchett, Jane Reynods, Patty Torres)

A teacher survival kit project grew from a need for centrally-located and easily transported materials that could be used to alleviate the frustration felt by teachers during the first critical days after the entry of a new ESOL student. These mesh bags of materials can be used by teachers with little or no special ESOL preparation as a short-term bridge to integration into the mainstream classroom environment.

Center Activities for Mainstream Teachers with Newly Arrived ESOL Elementary Students (Elementary) *(by Pat Allison, Judy Jordan, Paulette Raus, Cassie Smith, Jo Beth Stoecker, Beth Threlkeld)*

A longer term language-supportive structure is described in the third project, suggesting ways to establish study centers as positive environments for beginning ESOL students. Basic and supplementary materials and activities are recommended to help students develop the basic language and literacy necessary to fully participate in the regular classroom. An annotated and prioritized bibliography of teacher resources is included; results of a year-end teacher survey indicate a high level of satisfaction with this approach.

S.O.S. (Survival Opportunities for Students) (Elementary)
(by Marie Andrade, Sally Emery, Cathy Hague, Susan Hall, Priscilla Sena, Debbie Wright)

The S.O.S. project began by asking teachers what entering ESOL students needed to optimize their "survival opportunities" in the regular classroom. Based on their responses, this team collected sets of materials and activities that students with low-level English proficiency could use immediately. Supplementing these student materials are bibliographies of teacher resources to also optimize the inexperienced teacher's "survival opportunities."

Language Links for Lilburn Middle: Resource Guide for Parents of ESOL Students (Middle School) *(by Jan Eakin, Karen Freihaut, Millie Fuss, Jenifer Harris, Gail Ringenwald)*

This project acknowledges the importance of the family to successful school experiences for ESOL students. Forming a parent support network is recommended as one strategy to reduce the isolation felt by many families of ESOL students. This team designed a list of school-supporting activities likely to draw on the talents of international adults and to encourage parents to participate in the school community.

CELEBRATING CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Ideas for adapting classroom and school environments to celebrate the cultural diversity of second language learners and their families are the focus of the two projects in this section. Benefits of these approaches include changes in both knowledge and attitudes toward the special characteristics and abilities of all students, including those learning English as an additional language.

Assimilating the International Student into the High School Environment (High School)
(by Perry Dillard, Violet Evans, Claudia Jordan)

The first project outlines a variety of ways to more fully integrate ESOL students into the academic and social life of a culturally diverse high school. Students are invited to participate early in the planning phases to increase a sense of ownership and responsibility for such activities as an "International Corner" as a regular column in the student newspaper.

Cultural Celebrations Calendar (Elementary)
(by Carolann Brown, Candace Russell)

A Cultural Celebrations Calendar is one way to meet a school system goal of capitalizing on and meeting the needs of a community of increasing cultural diversity. The monthly calendar (September 1993 - August 1994) is intended by this team to promote awareness and pride in the rich traditions represented by students, teachers, and staff from a variety of cultures. Brief background information is given for each noted holiday with a bibliography of sources for further study.

Appendix C

Dissemination Efforts

Appendix C

Dissemination Efforts

Publications:

Hough, R. A. (Ed.). (1992). Gwinnett/GSU language leadership team projects, Year One. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University.

Hough, R. A. (Ed.). (1993). Gwinnett/GSU language leadership team projects, Year Two. Atlanta, GA: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University.

Rieken, E., & Hough, R. A. The school-based language leadership projects: Support for teachers, students, and families. TESOL in Action, In press (1993).

Hough, R. A., & Rieken, E. Language leadership teams: Staff development for ESOL and mainstream teachers. Submitted for publication in TESOL Journal (1993).

Conference Presentations:

Hough, R. A., & Gomez, B. "Multicultural storyteller's exchange." International TESOL Conference, Vancouver, BC, March, 1992.

Hough, R. A. "Multicultural books for all readers." Georgia Council IRA Conference, Atlanta, GA, March, 1993.

Hough, R. A. "Language leadership teams: ESOL and mainstream teachers working together." International TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA, April, 1993.

Darzi, P., deBone, S., & Jernigan, L. "Engaging students, teachers, and parents in beginning reading strategies." International TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA, April, 1993.

Schilling, J., Blankenship, E., O'Neal, D., Smith, S., & Waggener, J. "Helping the LEP student succeed: Sheltered courses in the secondary school." International TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA, April, 1993.

Hough, R. A. "Scaffolds for success: Integrating ESOL and content instruction." Paper submitted for presentation to the International TESOL Conference, Baltimore, MD, 1994.